net and cannot recur. In fact, the total of the refund of direct taxes, for sugar bountles, for the extinction of titles to Indian lands, for the ensus, for "first payments" upon pensions. and for new war vessels far exceeds the

amount of the present deficiency.

Of these expenditures a very small percentage can by any possibility continue. The refunding of the direct taxes is completed. No more sugar bountles will be paid. The cost of extinction of titles has been met. The consus rork is practically ended. "First payments" ipon pensions, it is true, seem likely to coninue so long as life shall last, but as we apnay, at least, hope that "first payments" vill become less numerous. The navy is big nough to take care of itself till we have more noney to spend for further additions, and the timate for 1895 is nearly \$3,000,000 tless than the amount paid last year.

Dropping these non-recurrent expenditures, liewing for the natural reduction in pension retary of the Treasury for the departments. amount of money required for the year ending June 30, 1895, need not exceed \$350,000,000. The actual expenditures for the year ending June last amounted to \$383,000,000. This sans a saving, on the one hand, of more than

The sole question, therefore, is that of reeipts, and here we enter the field of conjecure. It is easy to assume, and it has been seumed most persistently by advocates of the come tax, that reduction of duties means a rresponding reduction in revenues. But this s no more than assumption of fact, which does not and cannot exist, for the purpose of argumeanted in 1885 to \$181,000,000, in 1886 to 192,000,000, in 1887 to \$217,000,000, in 1888 \$219,000,000, in 1889 to \$223,000,000, and 1890 to \$229,000,000.

The increase in five years from 1885 to 1890 was \$48,000,000. A corresponding increase during the present five years would have yielded a revenue from customs for the year ending June 30, 1805. of fully \$280,000,000. Had the tariff then in force remained un-Had the tariff then in force remained untouched and business conditions been undisturbed by changes and fears of changes, there is no reason to doubt that this increase would have been realized. But the McKiniey act heams a law on October 1, 1890. Higher duties were imposed and customs receipts degreased with importations. Notwithstanding the extraordinary number and amount of purchases by importers in 1890 just prior to the enactment of the new law, to take advantage of the old rates, the receipts for the year ending Jun 30, 1891, fell off ten millions, and for the year following amounted to only 177 millions, or four millions less than in 1885. Moreover, despite the fact that the early part of the last facel year was a time of unusual business activity, the receipts barely reached 203 millions whereas in the ordinary course of increase indicated by the steady advance from 1885 to 1880 they would have exceeded 250 millions under the lower duties imposed by the old tariff.

1863, assuming no increase in revenue from whiskey because of the apprehension that 20 cents per gallon additional may encourage fraudulent distillation and the possibility of large quantities of whiskey being kept in bond through the next fleesi year, but allowing for the normal increase in the consumption of beer, for the additional receipts from playing eards and from lower duties on tobacco, the per-capita revenue for the year ending June 30, 1846, will be \$3.25, or 16 cents more than for the last fleesl year, Estimating the population at 70,600,000, Mr. Atkinson forecasts with reason a revenue from these sources of \$230,000,000,000.

NO NEED OF AN INCOME TAX. Accepting these estimates as approximately correct, the receipts for the year ending June 20, 1896, will be:

20, 1800, will be: Insernal revenue from the taxes on liquore, tobadose, banks, oleomagarine, playing cards, from sales of public lasds, and miscalianeous sources and from castems daties on iquors and Contours duties upon all articles except liquors and tobacces. 179,000,000

Total revenue

Expenditures

For legislativa Treasury,
civil departments, suppert of army and navy,
and completion of vessels,
postal deficiency, Indiana,
and public works, includleg river and harbor appropristions (returned to a

Treasury)
Estars on the public debt,
including that on recent
ioun

Fonzions (Mr. Atkinson's as

136,000,000

Total expenditures

celpts over expenditures......

Ordinary expenditures (likely to be less rollower rather than more). \$175,00,000 [Interest. 29,000,000 | Fensions (granting the accuracy of the reasons granting the accuracy of the reasons reasons reasons and figures on that basis). 150,000,000

Total expenditures

Leaving a margin of receipts over expen-

Leaving a margin of receipts over expenditures of \$20,000,000

There is no reason whatever for apprehension that, under the proposed tariff measure, the total receipts will tall below this amount. Under the old tariff, with a much emailer population, they amounted to 371 millions in 1888, 387 millions in 1888, 387 millions in 1888, 403 millions in 1889, and 362 millions in 1881, despite the prohibitive nature of the McKinley act. Is there any reasonable doubt that they will reach or exceed 374 millions in 1885? Or, on the other hand, considering the estimates presented, is there any excuss for expenditures exceeding 354 millions? If not, a margin of 20 millions will be allowed for mistakes in calculations and unforcesen continuencies for the next flexal year, which I suppose all will admit is quite sufficient.

If have not gone deeply into the details of this phase of the subject because of my lack of that knowledge and experience in dealing with the relations of national receipts to national expenditures which is essential to the proper performance of that tank. But sumder the proper performance of the task. But sumder the proper performance of the task. But sumder the proper performance of the task. But sumder the proper performance of the sum of the proper performance of the proper performance of the sum of the proper performance of the sum of the proper performance of the proper performance of the sum of the proper performance of performance of the proper performance of the performance o

THE SUN. WEDNESDAY, APRIL 18

The state of the content which he bears to raise

The state of the content which he bears to raise

The state of the content was a search of the content of vidual must have had something to do with it. He may have been more thrifty, more honest, more sober, more capable. But it matters not how he attained a position to command an income of more than \$4,000. He has the money, and because he has it, and for no other reason under heaven, he must pay another's debt to the Government. Is that just and right",? Done by an individual without sanction of law, it would be called highway robbery. And no act of Congress can change the character of the deed. Can we reconcile its performance to our sense of fairness and duty simply because we are more fortunate than the highwayman and have the power to act without fear of being sentto prison?

rears more fortunate than the highwayman and have the power to not without fear of being sent to prison?

Its sectionalism and insection in purpose. That it is in effect is impossible of deais. The total amount raised by this method from 1853 to 1873, inclusive, was \$333,331,268. Of this New England paid \$61,527,088, or 1848 per cent. The Middle States. New York. New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Delaware, and the District of Columbia paid \$17,185,011, or 53,4 per cent. more than one-half of the entire amount. The thirteen Southern States paid \$187,1871,073, or 6,8 per cent. Twenty Western States and Territories paid \$84,024,229, or 18,2 per cent. And the Pacific slope, comprising California. Orsgon, Washington, and Alaska, paid \$11,-032,185, or 3.4 per cent. New Jersey alone paid more than Indiana. Iows. Wisconsin, Minnesota, Ransas, Nebraska, Dakola, Montana, Idaho, and Colorado combined. Eliminating Rentucky only, New Jersey paid more than all of the Western States and Territories, all of the bouthern States, and all of the Pacific States combined.

In 1837 a single collection district in New York paid more than the five great Western States of Illinois, Indiana Iowa. Wisconsin, and Minnesota, and more than twice as much as Alaska, and single collection district in New York paid more than the five great Western States of Illinois, Indiana Iowa. Wisconsin, and Minnesota, and more than twice as much as Alasham, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louislana, North Carolina, South Carolina, Mississiph. Tennesses, Texas, Virginia, and West Virginia combined.

The total number of persons assessed in 1847 was 250,385, Of these more than 50 per cent. were citizenes of five States—New York, New Jorsey, Massachusett, Connecticut, and Pennsylvania.

I grant that the impoverishment of the South at that time and the rapid development of both the South and West since then make it protable that the disproportion would not be so great now under the same law. But that law taxed all incomes of more than \$1,000. Possibly this is the ITS SECTIONALISM AND INEQUITY.

What does the vote indicate? For reasons best known to themselves the majoritr refused to authmit the indome tax to a separate test, and the vote was taken on the internal revenue.

by the income tax.

It seems to me, therefore, a plain bustness proposition that any amount of money raised by this tax will serve no other purposational temptation to extravagance on the part of legislators who eater to the prejudices of the social decidence of the successful deci

That neither his judgment nor his ambition hanged with experience is shown by the fac-

That neither his judgment nor his ambition changed with experience is shown by the fact that, twenty years later, he sought the suffraces of the people on the distinct declaration that he contempiated a repeal of the tax. That he did not eventually "take the tax away" was due, not to his belief that it was just or wise, but to the conditions of the British Government which made its abolishment practically impossible.

Those conditions exist to-day, not in Great Britain alone, but in a yet more aggravated form in Germany, Austria, and Italy. And that is the reason, the only reason, why the tax is tolerated in those countries. Their needs for the maintenance of great armies and navies are so great and their resources are so small that they cannot do without it. France had practical experience with direct taxation under the house of Bourbon, and the result was revolution and anarchy. It was a bitter lesson, but so well heeded that, despite the vicisalitudes of the past century and the office of the countring needs of large sums of money, no general income tax has been imposed. Russis, too, has become rich enough to abandon it. Great Britain, Germany, Austria, and Italy—these are the shining lights of the income taxers, one of whom in the House of liepresentatives had the hardshood to assert that. So far from being unpopular in Great Britain, it has become more and more popular all the time." I should like to see the evidence upon which this assertion is based. The sole merit claimed for the scheme is that it benefits the poor—by robbing the rich, to be sure—but still accomplishing the result. Does it? To what extent have the poor beep benefited in England, where, according to Joseph Chamberlain, but per cent, of the workingmen who attain the age of 80 are "aimost certain to come upon the poor law for subsistence," and, aecording to Canon Blackley, "half our working people, if they reach '00 years of age, are doomed to die as paupers" or in Germany, or in Austria, or in Italy?

It is a well known fact that the cond

HOW IT WORKED AS A WAR TAX.

How it worked as a War tax.

It is far more sensible and in better accord with what we consider American ideas to analyze our own experience with this method of taxation. The necessities arising from the war of the rebellion forced us to adopt it as a temporary expedient in 1862. The results were wholly unsatisfactory at first, but frequent amendments finally produced a revenue from all sources of seventy-three millions in 1883. That was the high-water mark. From that time until 1873, when the law was repealed, the amount raised dwindled steadily until hardly five millions were collected.

What caused this actonishing diminution of receipts? Advocates of the lax say that it was due wholly to changes in the per cent of tax and exemptions. Let us see. The revenues by flacal years were as follows:

1963. \$32.741,858.25 | 1869. 84.791.855.84 1864. 20.244,731.14 | 87.15. 17.775,873.67 5 1865. \$32.65,071.74 | 1871. 18.16 - 180.75 5 1864. \$2.682,176.05 | 872. 18.45.8691.78 1867. \$60.014.49 84 | 1872. \$6,062.811.62 1965. \$41,465,566.06

The claim of the income taxers that the variation in revenue arose from the changes in the law is confirmed by results only while imminent danger confronted the Union. The revenues of twenty and thirty-two millions respectively in limit and limit were raised on a total tax of 8 per cent, on all incomes exceeding \$10,000. The increase of twolve millions under the same law was no more than natural. Official machinery for collection of the tax was being perfected, and the patriotism of the North responded to the obvious necessity of the Government.

Then the bux was changed to 5 per cent, on all incomes exceeding incomes exceeding \$600 and the percent, on

all exceeding \$5,000. This produced \$73,000,-

yote was obtained on the income-tax proposition.

PURELY A POPULIST MEASURE.

If there remains any doubt on this noint, the truth is readily assertained by referring to the states where there was no fusion and consequently no possibility of misinterpretation of the actual causes of the results. Take any of the actual causes of the results. Take any of the States whose Representatives in Congress aupported the tax. As neither the Democratio nor the Republican platform favored the plan, it would be only fair to combine the votes for Cleveland and Harrison against those for Weaver. But make the comparison on the vote for Mr. Cleveland alone. What is the result? In Alabama the vote was 138,138 for Cleveland to 85, 181 for Weaver; in Arkansas, 87,834 to 11,831; in Florida, 30,143 to 4,845; in Georgia, 124,381 to 42,397; in Indiana, 202,740 to 22,208; in lowa, 186,397 to 20,516; in Rentucky, 175,461 to 23,500; in Mississippi, 40,237 to 10,256; in Missouri, 208,388 to 41,-213; in North Carolina, 132,951 to 44,736; in Ohio, 404,115 to 14,850; in South Carolina, 54,392 to 24,07; in Tennessee, 138,874 to 23,-477; in Texas, 239,148 to 164,888; in these States there was an opportunity to vote for tariff reform without an income tax or for tariff reform without an income tax or for tariff reform without an income tax, and the people wave so little attracted by the proposition that all combined throughout the entire Union gave Gen. Weaver a smaller total vote than the total vote of New York State alone.

It may be, as I have said that since that time a majority in these States have been led to believe that this method of making others pay their taxes would hencell themselves, but it is very evident that they did not so believe that the method of making others pay their taxes would hencell themselves, but it is very evident that they did not so believe that the method of all right thinking men. For my part I firmly believe that the people of the South and West and all right thinking men. For my part I firmly believe that the PUBELY & POPULIST MEASURE.

THE DEMOCRACY ALWAYS AGAINST IT.

It is un-Democratic. From the day on which
the Democratic party sprang into existence to
the present time it has ateadrastly opposed
this method of taxation. Thomas Jefferson
enunciated the principle upon which this opposition is based when he said:

position is cased when he said:

It take from one because it is thought that his own
intuistry or that of his father's has acquired too much,
in order to spars others who or whose fathers have not
exercised equal industry and said, is to volute arbitrarily the first principles of association, the guarantes
to every one of a free energies of his industry and the
froits acquired by it. The people approved this sentiment, the party accepted it, and in the first I emocratic Adulatistration of the Government, while Thomas Jefferson occupied the Presidents chair, the tax was abolished. During the many succeeding periods of Democratic rules return to the avatem was never contemplated. Even during the civil war, whon, if even, it was necessary, the party as an organization opposed its adoption, and as late as 1884, when, for the first time in a generation, a Democratic President was elected, the platform of the party contained the distinct declaration that from the foundation of the Government taxes collected at the Custom Houses have been the ohief acuree of Federal revenues, and such they must continue to he. Against this decisration must be placed that of the chief advocate of the tax in the House of Representatives, who, when asked when the Democratic party had piedged itself to this tax, replied:

times, it isn't the ground for some form of direct tax attors such as the last us wips away the robbet and uncome tax as a logical result of that pistform.

Mr. President, as a Democrat and a member of that Convention. I repudiate any such interpretation of the pistform of 1802. The Democratic party is not a free-trade party, and the mere fact that an insignificant number of free-trade theorists have engrafted themselves upon it cannot make it so. "Taxes collected at the Custom Houses have been the chief source of Federal revenue, and such they must continue to be." Nor can the utterance of a Congressional Convention in Missouri nor the assertion of its candidate that an income tax is just and right congression and affirmed by every National Convention since the organization of the party.

A sop to socialism and anamenty.

I have aircady pointed out the fact that there was no hint of an income tax in the Democratic platform of 1802, and have shown its unpopularity by analyzing the vote for the Populist candidates. I take this opportunity to free mrself from any possible charge of misrepresentation. For the moment I had forgotten that the income tax proposition was inscribed upon the banpers of yet another political organization. I refer to the Socialist party, which also "demanded" a "progressive income tax the smaller incomes to be exempt." I pon that and other issues of like character Mr. Wing won the suffrages of his fellow citizens to the axient of 21,161 votes out of a total of 12,154,042. These may be added to those given to Gen. Weaver in the analysis which has preceded.

But, sir, if we accept the assertions of some of the advocates of this proposition, these 21, 101 citizens are entitled to a consideration which is not warranted by their numerical strength. "I tell you," says one, "when you oppose a measure of this kind, when you come to the great masses of the people and say that the wealthy of this Government shall bear none of its burdens, then you make a foundation for the argument of anarchy, soci

and added to those given to fee. Weaver in the
analisate witch has preceded.

The advocates of this propositions of some
of the advocates of this proposition, these Zi.
It is consistent of the advocates of this proposition, these Zi.
It is one warranted by their numerical
attenants. Italy not, says one, when you
to the great masses of the people and ray that
the weathy of this Government shall bear
it one of its burdens, then you make a foundation for the argument of anarchy, socialism,
the weathy of the french revolution,
the argument of anarchy, socialism,
and the argument of the second of the

people.
It would be as distinctly a betrayal of trust to yield to the one element as to yield to the other. The Democratic party has no better right to tax the few for the benefit of the many than to tax the many for the benefit of the few. And yet that and nothing else is the avowed purpose of this proposition.

DEMOCRACY AT THE PARTING OF THE WAYS.

to reimpose the income tax in Great Britain, said:

To resort to the desperate measure of an income tax is nothing less than to protein to the world that your resources are exhausted, and that indirect taxation has reached its limits. France, in all her struggles, has never resorted to an insome tax, because her people are more imbused with the spirit of liberty than any other nation in Europe. An income tax is an incompruous incorporation into our Government of the decal methods of political systems with which ours has nothing in common, and against which ours has nothing in common, and against which ours is, or ought to e. an emblasoned protest before the world. It has had its origin in the necessities of military government, and it has been tolerated because the necessities of liberty. Its proceedings accede than the situate of liberty. Its proceedings acceded than the situate of liberty. Its proceedings of the violences of the inquisition. Herein lies the instinctive revoit of the American citizen against this form of tax.

The English statesman of 1842, recalling the effect of the stamp act of 1765 and the abolition of income taxation, under the leadership of Thomas Jefferson, had a clearer understanding of the temper of the American people than some of our own statesmen seem to possess to-day. He spoke truly and accurately when heldeclared that it had been tolerated only where "the necessities of war" were held "more sacred than the rights of liberty," that "its methods are a counterpart of the violences of the Inquisition." and that—I wish to emphasize these words— herein lies the instinctive revoit of the American citizen to this form of tax."

How did it happen that at this early day it was a recognized fact in other countries that the American citizen does "instinctively revoit" against adirect tax upon his earnings? Here was a distinct national characteristic so well undersood that it was held up as an example to other Governments less fortunate. Could it have been due to any other condition than tha

pendance and mas been emphasized certainly in every Demogratic platform from the days of Jefferson to the present time?

A DHECT TAX AND UNCONSTITUTIONAL.

The assumption of Lord Russell was fully justified by the fact that we had eliminated this method from our system of taxation at the very beginning of independent government. But there was another warrant for the assertion, quite as important and quite as explicit, in the Constitution of the United States, which declares that "no capitation or direct tax shall be laid unless in proportion to the census or enumeration."

It is difficult for a layman to understand what form of taxation can be more "direct" than a tax upon that which a man earns or receives from his earnings. It is yet more difficult to see how a tax upon 85,000 persons out of 70,000,000 can be "laid in proportion to the census or enumeration." It is not my purpose, and nobody knows better than myself that it is not within the range of my actilities to discuss the constitutionality of this or any other measure. But the fact cannot be overlooked that there has been a wide divergence of opinion on this point, not only among leaders at the har, but, so far as the principle involved in income taxation is concerned, in the Bupreme Court itself. It is true that on one occasion that great tribunal declared that an income tax was not at variance with this provision of the Constitution, but on another it said plainty:

To lay with one hand the power of the Government on the property of the stituen and with the other to know the page tayered individuals it is none the less robsery terames it is done under the forms of law and activity its attaction.

One does not need to be a lawyer to understand that. It does not matter whether the

One does not need to be a lawyer to under-stand that. It does not matter whother the

HOUSE FURNISHING HARDWARE.

Cutlery and Tea Trays. COUNTY AND TEATTRYS,
COOKING UTENSILS MOULDS LAUNDRY
GOODS, CHINA. CROCEERY, AND GLASS,
WATER FILTER AND COOLES, CREAM
PREFEZES, CAMPHOR WOODS AND CEDAR
TRUNKS, EDDY REFRIGERATORS.

CHARLES JONES, 900 HEGABWAY, Cor. Blat st.,

Prof. Amass Walker has the correct idea. He does not attempt to deny the inquisition. He admits and upholds it. The business man, he argues, would derive a benefit from the necessity of keeping his accounts posted, and he could not mislead the argue-yed collector because—I quote Frof. Walker's own words—"his neighbors and competitors have an eye upon him if they believe he is making false statements, and he cannot long escape detection." Meanwhile, it is, of course, his duty as a citizen devoted to the best interests of his country to keep an eye upon the "neighbors and competitors in business." who are watching him. The wit of man could not devise a scheme better adapted to the tractice, of bribery on the one hand and of blackmail on the other. "Mind your own business." Is a good American adags, and I cannot believe that it is wise to give the sanction of law to "spy upon your neighbor." as a substitute. But the creation even of a system of personal espionage from one end of the country to the other is by no means the most harmful of this bill's irresistible effects upon progress and development. At tax upon incomes is a tax upon industry, upon seconomy, upon brains, upon achievement. It not only provides for additional taxation without additional representation, but puts a premium upon dishonesty and evasion of the law. I care nothing for the mock heroics of those who insist that no punishment is too severe for a citizen who would try to avoid payment of taxes. You cannot reform human nature by statute. Nor can you create and nourish patriotic sentiments by imposition. An attempt to do so by this or any other method of like nature can only engender class hatted and sectional distrust, and when you do that you restrict inevitably the development of the South and West, which is now being accomplished by the use of money from the East.

THE SPY SYSTEM.

ITS POLITICAL CONSEQUENCES.

The public unwisdom of such a measure seems to be obvious. Of its political folly I shall say nothing at this time beyond this: that in my judgment its first effect will be to doprive the Democratic party of a Governor in New York, a benator from New Jersey, and 50 per cent, of its present eastern representation in the House of Representatives. If it is the desire of the advocates of this bill to drive every Eastern State into the Republican party, to encourage the Populiats of the South and West to follow up their "entering wedge," and to practically eliminate the party of Jefferson from particination in public affairs, they can find no surer way to accomplish their purpose than that which they have chosen.

THE CASE EUMMED UP.

THE CASE SUMMED UP.

I have thus endeavored, Mr. President, to establish the justice and accuracy of the conclusions which I stated at the beginning.

I have shown from the estimates of the Secretary of the Treasury and of Mr. Atkinson and by the other confession of the Chairman of the Committee on Finance that a tax upon incomes is unnecessary.

I have shown from the bill itself and from the facts of history that it is sectional and unjust.

the facts of history that it is sectional and from just.

I have shown by our own experience and by the testimony of English financiers that it is unsuccessful.

I have shown by comparison of the latest vote for tariff reform with an income tax with the vote for tariff reform without an income tax that it is unpopular.

I have shown from the declaration of Thomas Jefferson and of every Democratic platform since the organization of the party that it is un-bemocratic.

I have shown that it is contrary to the spirit, if not the letter, of the Constitution, and, therefore, un-American.

I have shown that it is an unwarranted inquisition into the private affairs of individuals, a bar to progress and development, and, therefore, unwise.

AN APPEAL TO THE SOUTH.

AN APPEAL TO THE SOUTH.

I have only to say, in conclusion that nobody regrets more earnessly than inraelf the
necessity of touching upon the sectional character of this legislation. It has ever been my
locast that the legislation party is the sectional
party and that the organization to which I profess allegiants is free from bias of any kind.
Hut the truth cannot be ignored, and to bring
the full enormity of what they are doing bome
to my friends from the South, I sak them to
consider a parallel proposition.

Suppose the colored voters of Misaissippi or
Alabams or any other Stafe were in a majority in that Stafe. Suppose they should elect a
Governor and a majority of both Houses of



Washington, D. Q.

Rests the Tired Brain

Hood's Sarsaparilla Gives Nerve Strength and Bodily Health

If the learned Justice who wrote this opinion had been passing judgment upon the income tax proposition now before us he could not have spaken more explicitly, for no conceivable law could more lully meet the requirements of his reprotation. It does openly and a rowedly, and in unmistakable language, "extort the party's oath," and "compet the production of his private books and papers." And for what purpose, may I ask, if not to prove his evasion of the law, or, in the more forceful disting of the Supreme Court, "to convict him of a crime?"

Buch methods, our highest judicial tribunal declares, are "abhorrent to the instincts of an American." exactly as Lord Russell stated in 1842. They "may suit the purposes of despotic nower," but they "cannot abide the pure atmosphere of political liberty and personal freedom.

If I were a lawyer, accustomed to legal ways, I should not hesitate to rest my case upon this finding of the Supreme Court. No stronger condemnation of its un-Americanism could be desired.

And so I repeat that, despite the declaration of the Supreme Court that it is not contrary to the letter of our fundamental law, it is a contradiction of the theory and traditions of our national belief, directly opposed to the spirit of the Constitution itself, and as un-American as any direct 'ax that could be laid in deflance of the injunction that all shall be "in proportion to the census or enumeration."

It is Despotism.

It is unwise. Individual freedom from des-Hood's Pills are "Much in Little." "Gentlemen: I have used Hood's Sarsararilla and Hood's Vegetable Pills for many years and consider them the best on the market. Hood's Sarsaparilla has given me health and strength from time to time when tired and

Worn Out From Overwork and the worry of business. It has purified my blood, tened my nerves, and rested my tired

Hood's Sarsa-Cures

the bowels, relieve sick headache and indiges-tion, and thus assist tired nature to remove disease and restore health."—J. M. CROUKER 1,419 lthode Island Avenue, Washington, D. Q. Hood's Pills are purely vegetable, and de not purge, pain or grine, Sold by all concepts,

Morses, Carriages, &c.

VAN TASSELL & KEARNEY,

150-182 EAST 15TH ST.
128, 126, 127, 129 EAST 12TH ST.

BROUGHAMS 127, 129 EAST 12TH ST.

SCROLL BROUGHAMS, OUTGOON ROUGHAY,
ANTIQUE BROUGHAMS, PHYSICIANS BROUGHAY,
ANTIQUE BROUGHAMS, PHYSICIANS BROUGHAY,
AND SECOND HAND. LARGESTS STOCK A
VARIETY IN NEW YORK, LOW PRICES, HANDSO
LIGHT ORNSHEES, WITH DETACHED SEAT, BRAKE,
ABS, LANDAULS, OWNIRUSES, COUPE ROCKAWAY,
LANDAULSTS, OGTAMON BOCKAWAY, DRA

shall we are in the majority. We have the power the industrious and prosperous must pay the taxes of the industrious and prosperous must pay the taxes of the industrious and prosperous must pay the taxes of the industrious and prosperous must pay the taxes of the industrious and industrial would you reproduce that might makes right in that case as in this? Would you uphold as just the very method which you now pronounce ideal? Would you support the law? Would you denounce your neighbor for evading it? Would you cropulously avoid evasion yourself? Would you cheerfully throw open your account books and disclose the condition of your private affairs? Would you. I say, receive the collector of such a tax with obedience in your hearts?

Do you understand now why we of the East oppose this law? And is it a proper return for the help which we have given to you in ridding yourselves of oppression to turn around at the first opportunity and inflict upon us a law so odious that we cannot hope to make it seem endurable to our people? Is extinction of the party in the North the penalty we Democrats must pay for extending aid and sympathy to you of the South? If this entering wedge shall be driven in until the next national campaign resolves into a contest between the Respublicans and the Populists, who will be responsible for the sectional lines upon which it will be decided? And where do you think we Democrats of the North will stand in such a contest to the party in the contest of the North will our interests its?

publicans and the Populists, who will be reasonasible for the sectional lines upon which it will be decided? And where do you think we Democrated. The North will stand in such a struggle? Which way will our interests lie?

THE SUPREME DUTT OF DEMOCRACE.

I have tried, Mr. President, to discuss this question without passion or prejudice. But, sir, I say plainly here and new that, when the struggle does come, as it seems bound to come if this beginning be made. I for one shall be found fighting for my own. Farty ties grow weak when they make disregard of one's own people the test of scality. And I do not hesitate to add that even the mistrice of the lepublican harry of the test of scality. And I do not hesitate to add that even the mistrice of the lepublican harry of sulfits and the communism of the found of right to tay the charge as my noor. But, sir, whatever may be they judgment. God forbid that I should ever betry those whom I represent in this chamber of fail to de that which, in my own judgment, best conserves the interests of the Democratic party and of the American people.

We want to make this a country where ne man shall be taxed for this private beasend of another man, but where all the bleasings of free government, all the influences of church and school, allour resources, with the skill and ecisence and invention applied to their development, shall be the common uniaxed heritage of all the scalitace of all, adding to the happiness of all. Adding to the happiness of all. Those are the eloquent words of the Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. The sentiment is noble. The purpose is worthy of the best minds and trues thearts. But it can never be accomplished by the passage of a bill which does avowedly "tax one man for the private beached, all our resources, with the skill either be forced upon us by sheet which are the substantion and the structure of the substance of the substan

the land.
Refuse to do that, then God save the Demo-cratic party!

Killed Her Stepson, Who Threatened Her. PITTSFIELD, Ill., April 17 .- Mrs. Leon Plaisneger ordered her stepson to do some work yesterday, and he advanced toward her with a kulfe. The got a revolver and dred killing him instantly.

COLGATE & CO.'S

1806 LAUNDRY SOAP.